

1 **Nasogastric tube in critical care setting: combining ETCO<sub>2</sub>**  
2 **and pH measuring to confirm correct placement**

3 **Short title: Nasogastric tube in critical care setting**

4 S. Ceruti<sup>1\*</sup>, S. Dell'Era <sup>2</sup>, F. Ruggiero<sup>3</sup>, G. Bona<sup>4</sup>, A. Glotta<sup>1</sup>, M. Biggiogero<sup>4</sup>, E. Tasciotti<sup>2</sup>, C.  
5 Kronenberg<sup>2</sup>, A. Saporito<sup>2</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Critical Care, Clinica Luganese Moncucco, Lugano, Ticino, Switzerland

8 <sup>2</sup> Service of Anesthesiology, Ospedale Regionale di Bellinzona e Valli, Bellinzona, Ticino,  
9 Switzerland

10 <sup>3</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Clinica Luganese Moncucco, Lugano, Ticino, Switzerland

11 <sup>4</sup> Clinical Research Unit, Clinica Luganese Moncucco, Lugano, Ticino, Switzerland

12

13

14

15 **\* CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

16 E-mail: [samuele.ceruti@moncucco.ch](mailto:samuele.ceruti@moncucco.ch) (SC)

17

18

19

20

21

## 22 **Abstract**

23 **Introduction:** nasogastric tube (NGT) placement is a common procedure performed in critical care  
24 setting. Chest X-Ray is the diagnostic gold-standard to confirm correct placement, with the  
25 downsides of both the need for critical care patients' mobilization and intrinsic actinic risk. Other  
26 potential methods to confirm NGT placement have shown lower accuracy compared to chest X-ray;  
27 ETCO<sub>2</sub> and pH analysis have singularly yet investigated as an alternative to the gold standard. Aim  
28 of this study was to determine thresholds in combine measurements of ETCO<sub>2</sub> and pH values, at  
29 which correct NGT positioning can be confirmed with the highest accuracy.

30 **Material & Methods:** a prospective, multicenter, observational trial; a continuous cohort of  
31 eligible patients was allocated to two arms, to identify clear cut-off threshold able to detect correct  
32 NGT tip positioning with the maximal accuracy. Patients underwent general anesthesia and  
33 orotracheal intubation; in the first group difference between tracheal and esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub> values  
34 were assessed. In the second group difference between esophageal and gastric pH values were  
35 determined.

36 **Results:** from November 2020 to March 2021, 85 consecutive patients were enrolled: 40 in the  
37 ETCO<sub>2</sub> group and 45 in the pH group. The ETCO<sub>2</sub> ROC analysis for predicting NGT tracheal  
38 misplacement demonstrate an optimal ETCO<sub>2</sub> cutoff value of 25.5 mmHg, where both sensitivity  
39 than specificity reach 1.0 (AUC 1.0,  $p < 0.001$ ). The pH ROC analysis for predicting NGT correct  
40 gastric placement demonstrated the optimal pH cutoff value at 4.25, with a mild diagnostic accuracy  
41 (AUC 0.79,  $p < 0.001$ ).

42 **Discussion:** A device capable of combining the presence of a *negative marker* with a *positive*  
43 *marker* could be accurate enough in identifying the correct NGTs positioning. Further studies are  
44 required to validate the reproducibility of these results by a specific device, whose accuracy also  
45 ought to be compared with standard chest X-ray.

46 Trial number: NCT03934515 ([www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov))

47

## 48 **Introduction**

49 Nasogastric tube (NGT) placement is an extremely common procedure routinely performed on  
50 patients in critical care setting.[1] This simple procedure however is not riskless: serious  
51 complications can occur, especially in sedated, intubated and paralyzed patients, when cough reflex  
52 have been abolished[2]. The incidence of complications during NGT positioning is around 4%, with  
53 both a high morbidity[3], possibly leading to a prolonged hospital stay and higher costs and an  
54 increased mortality[4].

55

56 Currently, the gold standard for correct positioning confirmation is the Chest X-Ray[5], which  
57 implies the use of ionizing radiation (4  $\mu$ Sv for radiography). This may not be negligible  
58 considering that critical patients, during their hospital stay, may require multiple NGT placements  
59 and repositioning after displacement. Furthermore, in critically ill patients the image receptor is  
60 placed directly under the back, requiring their passive mobilization, which increases both staff  
61 workload and clinical risks (for example of accidental extubation or hemodynamic instability).

62

63 Several alternatives have been investigated in order to confirm correct NGT placement; these  
64 include the so-called *bubble technique*[6], frozen NGT[7], gastric auscultation[8,9], aspiration from  
65 the NGT[10,11], gastric ultrasound[12–14], biochemical markers[15][16] and the use of  
66 magnets[17]; however none of them was associated to a high diagnostic accuracy. Some pilot  
67 studies have shown that measurements of end tidal CO<sub>2</sub> (ETCO<sub>2</sub>) with a graphic capnometer could  
68 be used to determine whether NGT tip has been erroneously placed at tracheal level[18–22], others  
69 that pH measurements can distinguish a correct NGT tip position from an esophageal positioning,  
70 by analyzing the relative pH levels[23,24]. In those studies, however, threshold values of ETCO<sub>2</sub>  
71 and pH able to discriminate between correct and failed positioning have not been determined: the

72 two measurements had never been associated, the global accuracy of each methodology was rather  
73 low, or the sample size was insufficient to obtain a statistical significance. The feasibility to use  
74 these two parameters in a hypothetical device exploiting a double feedback mechanism to detect  
75 correct NGT placement with a high accuracy is an attractive possibility which demands further  
76 investigations.

77

78 Aim of the study is to analyze distributions between tracheal and esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub> values and  
79 between gastric and esophageal pH values, in order to identify thresholds values at which the  
80 correct positioning of NGT can be confirmed with high accuracy.

81

## 82 **Material & methods**

83 This is a prospective, multicenter, observational trial, conducted in a period of six months in two  
84 different acute Hospitals. The study has been registered (clinicaltrials.gov, NCT03934515) and  
85 approved by the regional Ethical Committee (Comitato Etico Cantonale, Bellinzona, Switzerland,  
86 Chairman Prof. Zanini – N. CE3548). A consecutive cohort of patients undergoing general  
87 anesthesia, with orotracheal intubation were enrolled; inclusion criteria were patients of both sexes,  
88 aged more than 18 years, fasting for at least six hours, who underwent general anesthesia and  
89 orotracheal intubation, for whom an oro/naso-tracheal tube positioning was planned according to  
90 clinical criteria. Exclusion criteria were patient's refusal or inability to give informed consent,  
91 pregnancy, known ongoing gastric or esophageal bleeding, coagulation impairment (defined as  
92 thrombocytes < 50 G/L, fibrinogen < 1.0 g/L, INR > 2.5, aPTT > 70 sec tested at the preoperative  
93 assessment), history of traumatic brain injury or polytrauma, esophago-tracheal fistulas, esophageal  
94 varices, ENT malformations and/or tumors, history of radiotherapy for ENT tumors. Patients in  
95 whom pH and/or ETCO<sub>2</sub> values were not measurable for technical reasons were excluded and  
96 considered as drop-outs.

97

## 98 **Randomization and allocation**

99 Eligible patients were allocated 1:1 to one of the two groups. Group A underwent ETCO<sub>2</sub>  
100 measurement; group B patients underwent pH measurement.

101

### 102 **Group A**

103 After anesthesia induction and orotracheal intubation, a suction probe was inserted within the  
104 endotracheal tube and tracheal ETCO<sub>2</sub> were measured at 15 seconds through a capnometer  
105 connected to the probe. Both the probe and the NGT had the same diameter (12 Fr). After the  
106 measurement, secretions were aspirated as usual. Then, NGT was positioned using the standard  
107 approach and esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub> was measured at 15 seconds through a capnometer attached to the  
108 NGT. After the measurement, the capnometer was disconnected, while the NGT was left in place  
109 as usual. ETCO<sub>2</sub> values were registered in the data sheet and subsequently transferred into an  
110 anonymized electronic database; two sets of values were therefore obtained for each patient:  
111 tracheal and esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub>.

112

### 113 **Group B**

114 After anesthesia induction and orotracheal intubation, NGT insertion was performed according to  
115 local protocols. pH was than measured using litmus paper on liquid aspirated from the NGT. NGT  
116 was progressively inserted, measurements were taken on secretions aspirated from NGT at two  
117 different steps at two insertion depths: 25 cm from teeth (esophageal level) and at 40 cm from teeth  
118 (gastric level). If it was not possible to aspirate some fluid, 10 ml of NaCl 0.9% were inserted and  
119 then aspired back and pH measurements were taken on this washing fluid. All values were  
120 registered and archived as described above; two sets of values were therefore obtained for each  
121 patient: esophageal and gastric pH.

122

123

## 124 **Statistical analysis**

125 According to literature, a tracheal ETCO<sub>2</sub> value around 40 mmHg[25–27] was assumed as normal,  
126 while a normal esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub> was around 20 mmHg [28]. In order to have a significant  
127 difference between tracheal and esophageal groups, with a power of 90% and a significance level of  
128 0.01 (one-tailed z test), we calculated a numerosity of 35 patients. Anticipating a 10% drop-out rate,  
129 we included 40 patients for group A. With regard to the pH arm, we assumed an esophageal pH  
130 level normal value around 7[29] and gastric pH level ranging from 1.0 to 2.5 [30]. In order to have a  
131 significant difference between esophageal and gastric pH values, with a power of 90% and a  
132 significance level of 0.01 (one-tailed z test), we calculated a numerosity of 30 patients. Anticipating  
133 a 10% of drop-out rate, we included 35 patients for each measurement in group B. We tabulated the  
134 distribution of baseline variables across the study's sections, summarizing categorical variables by  
135 frequencies and percentage and numerical variables either by mean and standard deviations ( $\pm$ SDs),  
136 or by medians and interquartile ranges (IQR). Data distribution was verified using a Kolmogorov-  
137 Smirnov test. We executed a z-test for comparison of the two proportions, refusing the null  
138 hypothesis of no difference between the two if the p-value was  $\leq 0.01$ . In order to identify the  
139 threshold value of ETCO<sub>2</sub> which signaled endotracheal positioning of the NGT and the pH value  
140 threshold who identified a correct gastric location of NGT with high accuracy, the area under the  
141 receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was calculated for both ETCO<sub>2</sub> and for pH level,  
142 calculating the sensitivity, specificity and the likelihood ratios for the optimal cut-off point (CP) of  
143 the scale (Youden index and Number Necessary to Diagnose, *J* and *NND* respectively)[31]. Starting  
144 from the ROC curve, a “cumulative distribution analysis” (CDA) was performed[32], to better  
145 identify the gray zone starting from the zone defined by the values associated with a sensitivity and  
146 a specificity both of 90%[33]. All hypothesis tests were one-tailed and considered significant if p-

147 value was  $\leq 0.01$ . Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS.26 (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA) for  
148 MacOS.

149

## 150 **Results**

151 From November 2020 to March 2021, 85 consecutive patients were enrolled: 40 in the ETCO<sub>2</sub>  
152 group and 45 in the pH group. 19 dropouts occurred, due to incomplete information sampling  
153 during the procedure (such as the impossibility to measure pH); 68 patients were therefore included  
154 in the analysis, 33 in the ETCO<sub>2</sub> group and 35 in the pH group. Mean age was 54 years old  
155 (min/max 46 – 62) and 36 (55%) were men. All demographic data are reported in Table 1.

156 **Table 1. Demographics characteristic population**

	<b>ETCO<sub>2</sub> group</b>	<b>pH group</b>	<b>p value</b>
<b>Age</b>	54 (13.7)	60 (9.8)	0.09
<b>Sex male</b>	22 (66%)	14 (43%)	
<b>BMI [Kg/m<sup>2</sup>]</b>	25.4 (6)	30.6 (7.4)	0.36
<b>Systolic arterial pressure [mmHg]</b>	145 (29)	152 (28)	0.36
<b>Heart rate [bpm]</b>	80 (21)	77 (17)	0.43
<b>Respiratory rate [min]</b>	14 (3)	14 (2)	0.7
<b>Jatal hernia</b>	-	6 (18%)	-
<b>PPI intake</b>	-	12 (36%)	-
<b>Esophageal Reflux disease</b>	-	13 (39%)	-
<b>COPD</b>	7 (21%)	-	-
<b>Pulmonary Embolism</b>	1 (3)	-	-
<b>Heart disease</b>	5 (15)	-	-
<b>Tracheal value</b>	40 (7.1)	-	-
<b>Esophageal value</b>	11 (9.3)	5.1 (1.3)	-
<b>Gastric value</b>	-	3.2 (1.7)	-

157

158 Demographic characteristics and main study measurements. Data distribution were expressed as  
159 mean  $\pm$  SD (min-max) or median (25<sup>th</sup> – 75<sup>th</sup>) if they are not normally distributed according to  
160 Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

161

## 162 **Distribution analysis**

163 With regard to the ETCO<sub>2</sub> *distribution analysis*, 22 (66%) patients were men, 7 (21%) presented a  
164 diagnosis of COPD (4 patients of second degree, 1 patient of third degree); one (3%) patient  
165 presented a previous diagnosis of pulmonary embolism. Five (15%) patients had a history of heart  
166 disease (two patients with severity NYHA 1, three patients with NYHA 2) (Table 1), all with an EF  
167 greater than 50%. Mean tracheal ETCO<sub>2</sub> was 40 mmHg (SD 7.14), while mean esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub>  
168 resulted 11 mmHg (SD 9.3); a t-test score (Fig. 1) confirmed a significant difference (CI 99%, 24-  
169 33,  $p < 0.001$ ).

170 **Fig. 1 Tracheal and esophageal ETCO<sub>2</sub> distribution** Boxplots: the black bar indicates median  
171 ETCO<sub>2</sub> (38 mmHg and 14 mmHg respectively), while the blue areas include the interquartile ranges  
172 for each group.

173

174 Regarding *pH distribution analysis*, 14 (40%) patients were male, 6 (18%) presented a history of  
175 hiatal hernia, and 13 (39%) presented a diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux disease, with 12 (36%)  
176 patients receiving PPI therapy at the time of data sampling (Table 1); no patient was on enteral  
177 feeding during the analysis. Median gastric pH was 3.1 (1.6 – 4.95), while median esophageal pH  
178 resulted 5.15 (4.52 – 6.0); a t-test score confirmed a significant difference (CI 99%, 0.9- 2.9,  $p =$   
179 0.004, Fig. 2).

180 **Fig. 2 Measured of esophageal and gastric pH.** Boxplot distribution in all patients and in patients  
181 without PPI use. Regarding the whole group analysis, a t-test score confirmed a significant  
182 difference between esophageal and gastric values (CI 99%, 0.9- 2.9,  $p = 0.004$ ). The subgroup  
183 analysis involving patients without PPI showed a greater difference (CI 99%, 1.2 – 3.1,  $p < 0.001$ )



184 compared the whole group. The black bar indicates median pH, while the blue areas include the  
185 interquartile ranges for each group.

186

187 A subgroup analysis involving 20 (62.5%) patients without PPI, showed a median gastric pH of  
188 2.45 (1.05 – 4.05) and a median esophageal pH of 5.05 (4.52 – 6.0), with a greater difference of t-  
189 test score (CI 99%, 1.2 – 3.1,  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to all patients (Fig. 2). A comparison between  
190 the mean esophageal pH value in all patients with the mean esophageal value in patients without  
191 PPI resulted not significantly different (5.1 vs 4.9,  $p = 0.265$ ).

192

### 193 **ROC curve analysis**

194 The ETCO<sub>2</sub> ROC curve analysis for predicting NGT tracheal misplacement (Fig. 3A) demonstrate a  
195 perfect diagnostic accuracy with an AUC of 1.0 (CI 95%, 1.0 to 1.0,  $p < 0.001$ ); the optimal cutoff  
196 value resulted in an ETCO<sub>2</sub> value greater than 25.5 mmHg (Youden index  $J = 1$ ), where both  
197 sensitivity than specificity reach 1.0. The pH ROC curve analysis for predicting NGT correct gastric  
198 placement (Fig. 3B) demonstrated a mild diagnostic accuracy with an AUC of 0.79 (CI 95%, 0.67  
199 to 0.90,  $p < 0.001$ ); the optimal cutoff value was a pH below 4.25 (Youden index  $J = 0.593$ ), with a  
200 sensitivity of 0.908 and a specificity of 0.687.

201 **Fig. 3 ROC curves of EtCO<sub>2</sub> and pH method.** Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves  
202 showing the ability of the EtCO<sub>2</sub> method (figure 3A) and pH method (Figure 3B) to respectively  
203 identify a tracheal misplacement (ROC AUC 1.0,  $p < 0.001$ ) or a gastric correct placement (ROC  
204 AUC 0.79, CI 95% 0.67 – 0.90,  $p < 0.001$ ).

205

206 The subgroup analysis involving only patient without PPI confirmed a mild diagnostic accuracy,  
207 with an AUC of 0.78 (CI 95%, 0.63 – 0.93,  $p = 0.002$ ) with an optimal cutoff pH value below 3.9  
208 (Youden index  $J = 0.6$ ). The NND obtained for the ETCO<sub>2</sub> method resulted 1, while the NND for  
209 the pH method was 1.68 (1.66 in patients without PPI).

210 Gray zone plots were drawn throughout CDA curves starting from Youden index (Fig. 4) between  
211 the 90% of sensibility and 90% of specificity on the two sigma curves for each method (ETCO<sub>2</sub> and  
212 pH); for the pH the gray zone lay between 4.25 and 5.7 (Fig. 4) while for the ETCO<sub>2</sub> no gray zone  
213 was identified, as the tracheal and the esophageal distribution did not cross each other (Fig. 5).

214 **Fig. 4 Cumulative Distribution Analysis of pH detection.** Performed to determine the correct NGT  
215 placement with (4A) and without (4B) PPI use. The red line indicates the cutoff limit according to  
216 Youden Index (pH below 4.25 and pH below 3.9, with  $J = 0.593$  and  $J = 0.6$  respectively); the gray  
217 zone is shown, according with a sensibility than a specificity of 90%.

218 **Fig. 5 Cumulative Distribution Analysis of EtCO<sub>2</sub> detection.** Performed to exclude the NGT  
219 misplacement. The red line indicates the cutoff limit according to Youden Index ( $J = 1$ ).

220

## 221 Discussion

222 Nasogastric tube placement in sedated and intubated patients is a procedure potentially associated  
223 with dangerous complications. The gold standard to assess correct positioning is Chest X-Ray,  
224 which exposes patients to mobilization-related complications, such as devices displacement and  
225 hemodynamic and respiratory instability, as well as to actinic risk, due to the need of multiple X-  
226 rays.

227

228 Alternatives, such as pH and ETCO<sub>2</sub> measurements, when singularly analyzed, failed to show a  
229 superiority compared to chest X-Ray in determining correct NGT tip position[18,23,34], in  
230 particular due to lack of identification of an actual threshold value. Our study combines these two  
231 techniques, in order to investigate if, when applied together, they can accurately detect a correct  
232 positioning of the NGT tip. The use of a double feedback mechanism could in fact prove more  
233 accurate than one single technique. In this study, ETCO<sub>2</sub> distribution between the trachea and  
234 esophagus was evaluated intended as a potential *negative marker* to detect NGT misplacement in

235 the upper airways; at the same time, pH distribution between stomach and esophagus was evaluated  
236 as a potential *positive marker* for NGT correct placement. Significant differences between tracheal  
237 and esophageal ET<sub>CO</sub><sub>2</sub> measurements allowed a complete differentiation in the curve plotting  
238 distribution. Based on these results, the use of a qualitative capnometer connected to the NGT and  
239 set to detect the threshold value of 25.5 mmHg would be a potentially accurate *negative-marker*  
240 mechanism for tracheal NGT placement, with a very high sensitivity, thus avoiding any NGT  
241 misplacement.

242

243 Concerning the differences in results between gastric and esophageal pH, the distributional  
244 differences between the two obtained curves is not neat, especially in case of proton pump  
245 inhibitors usage, although extremely low pH values were shown to have a high specificity for  
246 gastric NGT placement. Fernandez et al published a review of diagnostic studies to test pH of  
247 aspirate fluids using a litmus paper; with this method, they evaluated if the NGT had been correctly  
248 positioned. It is to be noted that litmus paper color variation could report a value lower than the  
249 actual gastric pH, due to the litmus paper insufficient sensitivity[16]. A recent clinical trial by  
250 Gilbertson et al identified the cut off pH < 5.5 to distinguish between the correct positioning in the  
251 stomach[23]. In comparison with these two studies, in our trial, the threshold pH value able to  
252 minimize false positive rate, thus increasing the specificity of this *positive marker*, resulted 4.25.  
253 Noticeably, even if specificity for very low pH appears to be high, the oppositely low consequent  
254 sensitivity would affect the global test accuracy thus invalidating the *positive marker* mechanism  
255 for detection of gastric NGT placement (NND = 1.68), leading to potential misses of correct  
256 placement.

257

258 Furthermore, analyzing the data based on PPI therapy allows determining an even lower pH  
259 threshold for patients not receiving this class of medications (pH of 3.9), however guaranteeing the

260 same accuracy. In practice, a pH threshold of 4.25 would therefore assure an even better specificity  
261 in this subgroup of patients.

262 Based on our study, a device capable of combining the presence of a *negative marker* (such as  
263 ETCO<sub>2</sub>) with a *positive marker* (such as pH) could be accurate enough in identifying the correct  
264 positioning of NGTs. Further studies are required in order to validate the reproducibility of these  
265 results by a specific device, whose accuracy also ought to be compared with chest X-ray, the current  
266 diagnostic gold standard.

267

268 This study presented some limitations. This was a preliminary study assessing determined  
269 physiological variables; it is still unknown whether a device simultaneously sensing ETCO<sub>2</sub> and pH  
270 could determine correct NGT placement with high accuracy. The presumed esophageal and gastric  
271 NGTs placement have been determined based on the distance of the NGT tip from the teeth; there is  
272 not, therefore, complete certainty about NGT tip location. However, NGT placed in esophageal site  
273 a 40 cm was considered to be placed into the stomach. Moreover, the accuracy of the pH threshold  
274 value for the discrimination between esophageal and gastric NGT positioning resulted suboptimal.  
275 The use of a normal saline injection in order to measure pH on the aspirated fluid in case secretions  
276 could not be aspirated may have affected pH values in these cases.

277

## 278 **Conclusions**

279 In a critical care setting, the use of a device capable of combine the presence of a negative marker to  
280 exclude NGT misplacement (like ETCO<sub>2</sub>) and a positive marker to confirm correct NGT placement  
281 (as pH evaluation) could be quite accurate to improve correct NGT placement in unconscious  
282 patients. Further studies in this direction are needed in order to test this hypothesis.

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

## 290 **REFERENCES**

- 291 1. Seron-Arbeloa. Enteral Nutrition in Critical Care. J Clin Med Res. 2013.  
292 doi:10.4021/jocmr1210w
- 293 2. Sanaie S, Mahmoodpoor A, Najafi M. Nasogastric tube insertion in anaesthetized patients: A  
294 comprehensive review. Anaesthesiology Intensive Therapy. Via Medica; 2017. pp. 57–65.  
295 doi:10.5603/AIT.a2017.0001
- 296 3. Harris MR, Huseby JS. Pulmonary complications from nasoenteral feeding tube insertion in  
297 an intensive care unit: Incidence and prevention. Crit Care Med. 1989;17: 917–919.  
298 doi:10.1097/00003246-198909000-00016
- 299 4. Information S. Patient Safety Alert NPSA / 2011 / PSA002 □: Reducing the harm caused by  
300 misplaced nasogastric feeding tubes in adults , children and infants. Event (London). 2011.
- 301 5. Lortie MA, Charbonney E. Confirming placement of nasogastric feeding tubes. Cmaj.  
302 2016;188: e96. doi:10.1503/cmaj.150609
- 303 6. Prasad G, Garg R. The “bubble technique”: An innovative technique for confirming correct  
304 nasogastric tube placement. Journal of Clinical Anesthesia. 2011. pp. 84–85.  
305 doi:10.1016/j.jclinane.2010.03.006
- 306 7. Chun DH, Kim NY, Shin YS, Kim SH. A randomized, clinical trial of frozen versus standard

- 307 nasogastric tube placement. *World J Surg.* 2009;33: 1789–1792. doi:10.1007/s00268-009-  
308 0144-x
- 309 8. Mettieny N. Re: ‘effectiveness of the auscultatory method in predicting feeding tube  
310 location’ response. *Nurs Res.* 1992;41: 189. doi:10.1097/00006199-199205000-00013
- 311 9. Simons SR, Abdallah LM. Bedside assessment of enteral tube placement: Aligning practice  
312 with evidence. *American Journal of Nursing.* 2012. pp. 40–46.  
313 doi:10.1097/01.NAJ.0000411178.07179.68
- 314 10. Zimmaro Bliss D. pH and Concentration of Bilirubin in Feeding Tube Aspirates As  
315 Predictors of Tube Placement NA Metheny, BJ Stewart, L Smith et al. *Nursing Research*  
316 48(4):189-196, 1999. *J Parenter Enter Nutr.* 2000;24: 187–188.  
317 doi:10.1177/0148607100024003187
- 318 11. Metheny NA, Stewart BJ, Smith L, Yan H, Diebold M, Clouse RE. pH and concentrations of  
319 pepsin and trypsin in feeding tube aspirates as predictors of tube placement. *J Parenter Enter*  
320 *Nutr.* 1997;21: 279–285. doi:10.1177/0148607197021005279
- 321 12. Nguyen L, Lewiss RE, Drew J, Saul T. A novel approach to confirming nasogastric tube  
322 placement in the ED. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2012;30: 1662.e5-1662.e7.  
323 doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2011.09.010
- 324 13. Kim HM, So BH, Jeong WJ, Choi SM, Park KN. The effectiveness of ultrasonography in  
325 verifying the placement of a nasogastric tube in patients with low consciousness at an  
326 emergency center. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med.* 2012;20: 1. doi:10.1186/1757-7241-  
327 20-38
- 328 14. Vigneau C, Baudel JL, Guidet B, Offenstadt G, Maury E. Sonography as an alternative to  
329 radiography for nasogastric feeding tube location. *Intensive Care Med.* 2005;31: 1570–1572.

330 doi:10.1007/s00134-005-2791-1

331 15. Turgay AS, Khorshid L. Effectiveness of the auscultatory and pH methods in predicting  
332 feeding tube placement. *J Clin Nurs.* 2010;19: 1553–1559. doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
333 2702.2010.03191.x

334 16. Fernandez RS, Chau JPC, Thompson DR, Griffiths R, Lo HS. Accuracy of biochemical  
335 markers for predicting nasogastric tube placement in adults-A systematic review of  
336 diagnostic studies. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2010;47: 1037–1046. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2010.03.015

337 17. Tobin RW, Gonzales AJ, Golden RN, Brown MC, Silverstein FE. Magnetic detection to  
338 position human nasogastric tubes. *Biomed Instrum Technol.* 2000;34: 432–436.

339 18. Burns SM, Carpenter R, Truwit JD. Report on the development of a procedure to prevent  
340 placement of feeding tubes into the lungs using end-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> measurements. *Crit Care Med.*  
341 2001;29: 936–939. doi:10.1097/00003246-200105000-00004

342 19. Kindopp AS, Drover JW, Heyland DK. Capnography confirms correct feeding tube  
343 placement in intensive care unit patients. *Can J Anesth.* 2001;48: 705–710.  
344 doi:10.1007/BF03016209

345 20. Thomas BW, Falcone RE. Confirmation of nasogastric tube placement by colorimetric  
346 indicator detection of carbon dioxide: A Preliminary report. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 1998;17: 195–  
347 197. doi:10.1080/07315724.1998.10718746


348 21. Howes DW, Shelley ES, Pickett W. Colorimetric carbon dioxide detector to determine  
349 accidental tracheal feeding tube placement. *Can J Anesth.* 2005;52: 428–432.  
350 doi:10.1007/BF03016289


351 22. Frakes MA. Measuring end-tidal carbon dioxide: clinical applications and usefulness. *Critical*  
352 *care nurse.* 2001. pp. 23–26, 28. doi:10.4037/ccn2001.21.5.23

- 353 23. Gilbertson HR, Rogers EJ, Ukoumunne OC. Determination of a practical pH cutoff level for  
354 reliable confirmation of nasogastric tube placement. *J Parenter Enter Nutr.* 2011;35: 540–  
355 544. doi:10.1177/01486071110383285
- 356 24. Metheny N, Reed L, Wierseam L, McSweeney M, Wehrle MA, Ciark J. Effectiveness of pH  
357 measurements in predicting feeding tube placement: An update. *Nurs Res.* 1993;42: 324–  
358 331. doi:10.1097/00006199-199311000-00002
- 359 25. Robin ED, Whaley RD, Crump CH, Travis DM. Alveolar gas tensions, pulmonary  
360 ventilation and blood pH during physiologic sleep in normal subjects. *J Clin Invest.* 1958;37:  
361 981–989. doi:10.1172/JCI103694
- 362 26. Liu SY, Lee TS, Bongard F. Accuracy of capnography in nonintubated surgical patients.  
363 *Chest.* 1992;102: 1512–1515. doi:10.1378/chest.102.5.1512
- 364 27. Ellett MLC. Important Facts About Intestinal Feeding Tube Placement. *Gastroenterol Nurs.*  
365 2006;29: 112–124. doi:10.1097/00001610-200603000-00004
- 366 28. Sayah AJ, Peacock WF, Overton DT. End-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> measurement in the detection of  
367 esophageal intubation during cardiac arrest. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1990;19: 857–60.  
368 doi:10.1016/s0196-0644(05)81557-4
- 369 29. Tutuian R, Castell DO. Gastroesophageal reflux monitoring: pH and impedance. *GI Motility*  
370 *online.* 2006. doi:10.1038/gimo31
- 371 30. Evans DF, Pye G, Bramley R, Clark AG, Dyson TJ, Hardcastle JD. Measurement of  
372 gastrointestinal pH profiles in normal ambulant human subjects. *Gut.* 1988;29: 1035–41.  
373 doi:10.1136/gut.29.8.1035
- 374 31. Youden WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. *Cancer.* 1950;3: 32–35. doi:10.1002/1097-  
375 0142(1950)3:1<32::AID-CNCR2820030106>3.0.CO;2-3




- 376 32. Krouwer JS. Cumulative distribution analysis graphs--an alternative to ROC curves. Clin  
377 Chem. 1987;33: 2305–2306. doi:10.1093/clinchem/33.12.2305a
- 378 33. Coste J, Pouchot J. A grey zone for quantitative diagnostic and screening tests. Int J  
379 Epidemiol. 2003;32: 304–313. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg054
- 380 34. Elpern EH, Killeen K, Talla E, Perez G, Gurka D. Capnometry and Air Insufflation for  
381 Assessing Initial Placement of Gastric Tubes. Am J Crit Care. 2007;16: 544–549.  
382 doi:10.4037/ajcc2007.16.6.544






etCO<sub>2</sub>




pH



--- Specificity  
--- Cutoff value  
— Sensitivity  
Gray zone

**A**



**B**

